

REMARKS

Claims 1-45 were pending prior to this amendment. Claims 1-45 stand rejected. Claims 1-18, 22-23, 25, 27-34, 36 and 38-45 have been amended. Claims 19-21 and 35 have been cancelled. At least in light of the above amendments and the foregoing remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 38-45 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 on the basis that the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory matter.

Claims 38-45 have been amended.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-45 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) on the basis of being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2003/0037040 (Beadles).

Claim 1 has been amended. With respect to claim 1, Applicant claims a computer operable to display a document including text representing a plurality of different objects that each control different functionality of a network device. When the user changes a selected portion of the text, the computer exchanges communications with the network device immediately and prior to the user modifying a different portion of the text that corresponds to a different one of the objects. These communications are configured to dynamically modify a remote copy of the configuration file that is stored on the network device without exchanging an entire copy of the configuration file between the computer and the network device. This feature avoids certain disadvantages of prior configuration tools. *See* the present specification page 4, lines 1-6.

Beadles teaches the opposite of the claimed invention in that Beadles discloses a software wizard (illustrated in FIGS. 3-11) that accumulates policy selections as the user clicks through several product configuration pages. Only after the user has passed through all feature selection pages and clicked yes, does the computer reconfigure the device using all the accumulated selections at once. *See* FIG. 10 showing the sentence, “Click FINISH to create the new policy.” The computer does not exchange communications with the network device to reconfigure the network device after receiving a first selection and prior to receiving a second selection. Accordingly, the computer does not dynamically and interactively modify the policy while the user clicks through the configuration pages.

In contrast, claim 1 includes the feature of the computer configured to exchange communications with the network device immediately and prior to the user modifying a different portion of the text that corresponds to a different one of the objects. This feature allows the network device to be reconfigured dynamically and interactively while the user modifies the text displayed by the computer. Thus, claim 1 should be allowed. Claims 2-18 are dependent and should also be allowed.

With respect to claims 3-5, these claims have been amended and should be allowed for the additional reason that Beadles does not disclose the feature of the computer transferring an incomplete command fragment input by the user to the network device and relying on the network device to automatically perform command completion on the incomplete command fragment. *See* the present specification page 4, lines 17-22, page 3, lines 26-27, page 4, lines 1-4 and page 22, lines 8-11. Thus, claims 3-5 should be allowed for this additional reason.

With respect to claims 6-10, these claims have been amended to include other features not disclosed by Beadles and should be allowed for this additional reason. *See* the present specification page 16, lines 2-5, page 18, lines 26-27, page 19, lines 1-5, page 20, lines 26-27, page 21, lines 1-4 and page 22, lines 21-27. Thus, claims 6-10 should be allowed for this additional reason.

Claim 22 has been put into independent form. No amendments have been made to claim 22. The Office Action stated that claim 22 is rejected on the same grounds as claims 2-13; however, claims the original claims 2-13 did not recite the highlighting module. Therefore, the Office Action does not appear to cite to any section of Beadles for rejecting the novel feature of “a highlighting module for selecting a part of said document to implement said change, and for indicating which parts of said document have been modified.” Moreover, Beadles teaches no such feature. This novel feature provides numerous advantages; for example see the present specification page 2, lines 18-24 indicating some of the advantages of this feature. Thus, claim 22 should be allowed. Claims 23-26 are dependent and should also be allowed. Claims 19-21 have been cancelled.


Claim 27 has been amended and should be allowed for at least similar reasons as claim 1. Claims 28-32 are dependent and should be allowed. Claim 33 has been amended and should be allowed for at least similar reasons as claims 3-5. Claims 34 and 36-37 are dependent and should also be allowed. Claim 35 has been cancelled. Claim 38 has been amended and should be allowed for at least similar reasons as claim 1. Claims 39-45 are dependent and should also be allowed.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at 503-222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.



Michael A. Cofield
Reg. No. 54,630

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
210 SW Morrison Street, Suite 400
Portland, OR 97204
503-222-3613
Customer No. 20575